VOLUME IX NUMBER 2

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

APRIL 1935

EDITORIAL

ECONOMIC HISTORY AS SUCH HAS ONLY RECENTLY COME WITHIN the scope of Mennonite historical inquiry. Compared with the sources used in the study of church history proper, data which reveal the economic background and activities of the Anabaptist-Mennonites are usually more available. To be sure the record of their economic relationships is buried in governmental files and has found expression in many private observations. It needs to be searched out through varied ramifications. The origins of relevant information are indeed manifold. The toleration or non-toleration of Anabaptists and Mennonites is, for example, often one of the tokens that register their economic value to a country. The contribution of the group to national civilization frequently helped to decide in favor of their toleration. It was not only the persecution suffered in their early history, but the positive recognition of the economic value of Mennonites which brought them invitations to immigrate and settle in various countries. Certain of their achievements can definitely be ascribed to the economic and technical practices which they exported and imported during their many migrations between countries of different economic levels. The economic rôle of Mennonites has also been influenced very strongly by their ethical standards. They determined Mennonite attitudes regarding contacts, economic in character, or non-contacts with the world around them. Serious problems arising in this regard have sometimes caused new movements and led to greater differences between existing groups. Dr. David G. Rempel in his inquiry into the economic and social history of the Mennonites in Russia is aware of these latter points, but he does not enlarge upon the interpretative possibilities which they offer. He is setting forth the facts in a straight objective manner, a difficult task for the reason that in his

particular case important sources of information are inaccessible or have been destroyed altogether. This situation is calling for much perspicacity and versatility in methods of research. The writing on the history of the Mennonites in Russia has in all respects become the most complicated undertaking in the field. For this reason Dr. Rempel's work is unique in its accomplishment. It is an encouraging challenge to others who had given up in despair or found that they were not sufficiently enough prepared to tackle the job linguistically.

His article on "The Mennonite Migration to New Russia" contains a series of background sketches illustrating the broader significance of the achievements of the Mennonites in the economic life soon recorded in their new country. We see Mennonite history taking part in the emergence of large, new, fertile sections of the Russian Empire. It was the time when the "last frontier" in modern Europe was settled in a territory hardly more advantageous than that of the American prairies where the third and fourth generation of the same branch of Mennonites became pioneers in the 1870's. Greatly as the circumstances of immigration and colonization differed—Mennonite qualities remained the same. The colonization projects of Catharine II. and Alexander I. were shaped by policies of a mercantilistic as well as of a physiocratic character. It is known that the French Physiocrats, craving for an application of their theories centering in agricultural pursuits, desired to direct Russian reforms at the time. Very likely there were hints made in regard to Mennonite model farmers whose mode of living had fitted physiocratic philosophy so well in the West. The achievements of the Dutch Mennonites in Eastern German lands could match the reputation acquired in the West by their Swiss-German brethren.

Dr. Rempel's exposition of the aspects of the original colonizing interests offer quite a few technical details useful for a full understanding of the early history of the Mennonites in Russia. The article published in this issue presents the first chapter of a doctoral dissertation in history submitted in 1933 to Leland Stanford University.—*E. C.*

THE MÜNSTERITE FACTION IN THE EARLY ANABAPTIST MOVEMENT must continue to be the occasion of serious study if only to show the essential distinction between it and genuine Anabaptism which began in 1525 in Zurich, Switzerland, and was entirely different in its pure evangelical outlook from the confused Münsterites of a later day (1534-35).

Centuries of biased history writing have produced an official as well as a popular attitude which has blurred the picture of the original movement of Anabaptism. But there was a greater significance to this fact when viewed from the standpoint of those generations of evangelical Anabaptists who were labeled as of the Münsterite sort (or alleged to be likely to develop that way) simply to discount their earnest endeavors in founding a New Testament community. Such purposeful misinterpretation lived long through the centuries. An unbiased attitude in the writing of church history is, with the exception of a mere handful, only a very recent achievement. Similarly, secular historians were no less prejudiced. Strange as it may seem, the confusion of the (numerically insignificant) radical militant group with the multitude of evangelical pacifist Anabaptists and Mennonites can still be observed in modern times, if it be only the uninformed talk of more or less authoritative people. Stranger still, even a modern Mennonite historian (Dr. W. J. Kuehler in Amsterdam) can be found going astray by failing to distinguish carefully enough between Münsterite and genuine Anabaptist views. The reader must be referred in this regard to the exhaustive analysis by John Horsch of Kuehler's voluminous *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de Zestiende Eeuw,* Haarlem, 1932 (Volume VII, MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, 1933) which in the Spring of 1935 the Mennonite Press, Scottdale, Pennsylvania, issued as a pamphlet entitled *Is Dr. Kuehler's Conception of Early Dutch Anabaptism Historically Sound?*

It was the great German historian *Leopold von Ranke* who, early in the 19th century created a passion for source studies. In 1850 one of Ranke's best pupils, Carl Adolf Cornelius, in a doctor's thesis, *De fontibus, quibus in historia seditionis Monasteriensis Anabaptisticae narranda viri docti huc usque usi sunt,* prepared the way for an objective study of Anabaptism in general. In his wake a remarkable number of sound factual monographs were produced determined to state facts objectively on the basis of reliable source material. (Cp. Christian Hege, Art. "Geschichtschreibung," *Mennonitisches Lexikon*). Unfortunately Cornelius himself was not able to complete his master work on the *Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs* the first volume of which appeared in Leipzig in 1860.

Among Mennonites, Menno Simons' writings furnish abundant evidence on the distinction between genuine Anabaptists and Münster fanatics. In subsequent Mennonite historiography, authors, faced by absurd accusations, corrected the ancient and wicked

confusion of Münsterites and Mennonites which had resulted in various discriminations still reaching into our own time although in European countries only. Thieleman Jansz van Braght's *Bloedig Tooneel of Martelaarspiegel der Doopsgezinde en Weerlose Christenen of* 1660 is a document of self-defence in this respect as later still the popular Mennonite histories of the late Frau Anna Brons of the East Frisian and of Frau Christine Hege of the South German group. Christian Hege and Christian Neff, the editors of the *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* 1913 ff., are likewise engaged in honestly presenting factual material to set aright the wrong and harmful interpretations once purposely given to Mennonites and Mennonite history as if they were of the Münster sort.

In the American historiography of the Anabaptist movement the confusion indicated is far less evident unless borrowed from obsolete European literature. Originally, the great tradition of American tolerance prevented any serious interest in perversions and falsifications of that nature. As John Horsch sets out to tell the story of "The Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists of Münster" his approach is benefitted by an intimate knowledge of the history of the Reformation. To my knowledge there is no other treatment of the Münsterites in the English language which goes into this intricate subject so extensively in a fair attempt to consolidate the findings of quite a few recent historians who had attacked the Münsterite faction from a variety of angles. In a subsequent installment which is to show the contrasts that existed between Münsterites and Mennonites John Horsch, the biographer of Menno Simons, is expected to present an especially interesting contribution to the cause to which this periodical is devoted.—*E. C.*

THE MENNONITE MIGRATION TO NEW RUSSIA (1787-1870)[1]

I. The Colonization Policy of Catherine II. and Alexander I

David G. Rempel

In the second half of the eighteenth century the extensive regions of the Lower Volga in Russia were only sparsely settled. For the most part nomadic tribes of Tartars, roving bands of plundering Cossacks and various bandit elements found their home here. All this territory, therefore, was not only of little economic value to the state but also a source of endless trouble. The bandits constantly threatened the few permanent settlements and seriously interfered with the transportation of salt from the Elton Sea into the interior.[2] The government realized that to bring order to this frontier land and to make it economically profitable, it was necessary to settle on it a permanent population. The problem was where to get the requisite number of settlers. In the previous centuries when the frontier was extended slowly fugitives from justice and various sectarians filled up the newly conquered territory. But after the middle of the eighteenth century the southeastern and southern boundaries of the empire had been pushed forward so rapidly that the old method of spontaneous colonization proved entirely inadequate. Realizing that Russia at the time lacked the man power for an immediate extensive colonization of new country, and knowing, moreover, that the peasantry with its primitive economic and agricultural systems could not be expected to perform a rapid civilizing function, Catherine turned for the solution of the

---

1 The term New Russia is defined below on page 82. The following foreign terms are used in this article: *pud,* a measure of weight, equal to 36 English pounds (40 Russian lb.) ; *ruble,* a monetary unit. The pre-war gold ruble was equal to about 51.5 cents in U. S. A. currency. It was divided into 100 kopeks; *desiatin,* a measure of land area, equal to 2.7 acres; *government,* a major administrative division of the Russian Empire; *oblast,* also an administrative division, but much larger than the gubernia or government; *ukaz,* a decree issued by the Tsar, or in his name; *uiezd,* an administrative subdivision of the government.

2 The production of salt in Elton after 1749, when the government took over its production, amounted to 2-5,000,000 puds annually and was the chief source of supply of this commodity for the interior Russian provinces. Cf. G. G. Pisarevsky, "Nizhnee Povolzhie v tretiei chetverti XVIII veka," *Izvestia Pedagogichezkogo Fak. Azerb. Gosudarstv. Universiteta,* XIV (1929), p. 221.

problem to an extensive program of colonization from abroad.[3]

An important factor in this decision to recruit foreign colonists was the influence upon Catherine of contemporary Western European economic theories and the example of the colonization policies of other European countries.

This influence of contemporary population theories is evident in many of Catherine's writings. Already as Grand Duchess she had written:

> . . . Peace is necessary for this large Empire. We are in need of population . . . . If possible, make our extensive waste lands swarm with people. To achieve this, I do not think it advisable to compel our non-Christian subjects to embrace our religion, for polygamy is even more useful for the increase of a population . . . .[4]

In the Manifesto of December 4, 1762, she declared, among other things, that the increase of the empire's population would forever be her chief concern.[5] Again, in her famous "Instruction to the Commission for Drafting a New Code of Laws" she stated: "Not only does Russia have an insufficient population, but it also possesses enormous tracts of land which are neither inhabited nor cultivated. And so there cannot be too many encouragements to increase the number of people."[6]

The influence of the teachings of the Physiocrats is evident from the importance Catherine ascribed to agriculture, which she regarded as the basic source of a nation's wealth: "There can be no industry or well established commerce where agriculture is being destroyed or neglected." "Agriculture is the greatest work for

---

[3] It should be pointed out that Catherine was not the originator of the idea of bringing in foreign colonists. Her predecessor, Elizabeth, had planned to found agricultural colonies of foreigners, chiefly French Protestants, but was frustrated in this by the Seven Years War. Cf. Grigorii Pisarevsky, *Iz istorii inostrannoi kolonizatsii v Rossii XVIII v.* (Moscow, 1909), pp. 28-44. Hereafter cited as Pisarevsky, *Inostrannaia kolonizatsia.*

A number of military colonies, however, were founded during Elizabeth's time by the Serbian officers, Horvath, Shevich and Preradovich, in the province of Kiev and in the vicinity of Bakhmut, in the subsequently founded province of Ekaterinoslav. These colonists, some 16,000 men strong, were recruited from Serbs, Bulgarians, Greeks, Montenegrins, Hungarians, Moldavians, and Wallachians. *Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii,* XIII, No. 9 919 and 9 924. Also Apollon Skalkovsky, *Khronologicheskoe obozrenie istorii Novorossiiskago kraia* 1730-1823 (Odessa, 1836), I, 20-27; E. A. Zagorovsky, *Voennaia kolonizatsia Novorossii pri Potemkine* (Odessa, 1913).

[4] Imperatorskoe Russkoe Istoricheskoe Obshchestvo, ed., *Sbornik Imperatorskago Russkago Istoricheskago Obshchestva,* VII, 85. This collection of documents will hereafter be referred to as *Sbornik.*

[5] *Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov,* XVI, No. 11 720. Hereafter cited as *P. S. Z.*

[6] *Ibid.,* XVIII, No. 12 949, art. 265.

men. . . ." And again: "Agriculture is the first and the main work to which people ought to be encouraged. . . ."[7]

Of the colonization policies of other European countries that of Prussia exerted the greatest influence upon Catherine. This is shown by the similarity of language and the practical identity of the rights and privileges granted to foreign colonists by the Potsdam Edict of 1685 and Catherine's Manifesto of 1763.[8] Subsequent Russian legislation for the colonists likewise reflects the influence of the Prussian example. Finally, in settling colonists from abroad in New Russia the celebrated "Greek Project" of Catherine and Potemkin played an important role. This was a project to restore the Byzantine empire, the ruler of which was to be Catherine's son, Constantin. The colonization of New Russia was regarded by the Empress and Potemkin as the preliminary step necessary for the successful realization of this plan.[9]

Once the decision to invite foreigners had been made, Catherine acted with the vigor that characterized the initial steps of all her undertakings. In order to do away with bureaucratic formalities she instructed the Senate on October 14, 1762, "once and for all" and "without further report to her" to consult only the Office of Foreign Affairs concerning foreign colonists.[10] On December 4 of the same year she issued a manifesto inviting foreigners, except Jews, to come to Russia, promising her benevolence and protection to anyone answering the call.[11] At the same time she wrote the Procurator General (chairman of the Senate): "This manifesto must be made public in all languages and printed in all foreign newspapers."[12] In pursuance of this order the Senate sent the Office of Foreign Affairs copies of the manifesto in the various European languages with the request to forward them to the Russian diplomatic representatives abroad for distribution. In sending out these copies, the Office of Foreign Affairs in a circular letter of January 7, 1763, instructed its agents not only to make the appeal for colo-

---

7 *Ibid.*, arts. 294, 297 and 313 respectively.

8 Max Beheim-Schwarzbach, *Hohenzollernsche Colonisationen* (Leipzig, 1874), pp. 48-53, 162-164, 276-279. Georg Leibbrandt, *Die Auswanderung aus Schwaben nach Russland*, 1816-1823 (Stuttgart, 1928), pp. 100-102.

9 Pisarevsky, *Inostrannaia kolonizatsia*, p. 227. Skalkovsky, *op. cit.*, I, 132. Cf. also A. Brueckner, *Potemkin* (St. Petersburg, 1891), pp. 74-76 and K. Valishevsky, *Roman Imperatritsy—Ekaterina II.* (St. Petersburg, 1908), pp. 309-312 and 408-413.

10 B. Bilbasoff, *Geschichte Katharina* II (Berlin, 1893), II, 277.

11 *P. S. Z.*, XVI, No. 11 720. The manifesto also permitted Russian army deserters and sectarians to return home.

12 Bilbasoff, *op. cit.*, p. 279.

nists known by printing it in the various newspapers of the countries where they were stationed, but also to do everything possible to enable it to produce results.[13]

Owing to the fact that several European countries, for example France, Spain and Prussia, had prohibited emigration, not all the Russian representatives were able to comply with the instruction. Accordingly the manifesto appeared only in the newspapers of England, Scotland, Ireland, Denmark, Sweden, Austria, and in the French and German newspapers published in Holland, the German Free Cities, and in certain small German states.[14] This appeal brought forth no results, chiefly because it was drawn up in too general terms, making no specific guarantees concerning political rights and religious liberty. Then, too, many of the countries in which the appeal was scattered broadcast had colonies of their own to be settled. Several Russian ministers abroad at once pointed out the defects of the manifesto.[15] Accordingly, after an exchange of notes and a series of conferences between Catherine, Glebov, the chairman of the Senate, and Count Vorontsov, the chancellor,[16] three measures were adopted on July 22, 1763 which became the foundation of the government's colonization policy for the next forty years.

The first of these acts established the so-called *Kantseliaria opekunstva inostrannykh kolonistov* ("Bureau of Guardianship of the Foreign Colonists") to deal with all the problems arising in connection with the establishment and development of foreign colonists in Russia.[17] It was to supervise the activity of the Russian diplomatic representatives and other agents in the matter of recruiting colonists and sending them to Russia; to have on file a list of lands suitable for colonization, and to see to it that foreigners, upon their arrival, were courteously received and provided with living quarters until they should have selected their place of future abode. The bureau had the status of a separate ministry and was responsible to the empress alone. She appointed its chairman, who

---

13 *Sbornik,* XLVIII, 251.

14 Pisarevsky, *Inostrannaia kolonizatsia,* p. 66.

15 *Ibid.,* p. 49.

16 P. Pekarsky, ed. *Bumagi Imperatritsy Ekateriny II. khraniashchiasia v gosudarstvennom arkhive Ministerstva Inostrannykh Del* (St. Petersburg, 1871), I, 301, 303. *Arkhiv kniazia Vorontsova* (Moscow, 1870), XXVIII, 26.

17 According to Sergei Soloviev, *Istoria Rossii s drevneishikh vremen* (St. Petersburg, n. d.), XXV, 1486, this department was created to obviate the foreigners' distrust for the administration of justice in Russia.

in turn selected the other members of the bureau. Count Gregory Orlov was its first chairman.[18]

The second act was another manifesto inviting foreigners to immigrate to Russia. Prospective colonists were extended the following rights and privileges: 1. free board and transportation from the Russian boundary to the place of settlement; 2. the right to settle in any part of the country and to pursue any occupation; 3. a loan for the building of houses, the acquisition of farm implements, the establishment of factories, et cetera; 4. perpetual exemption from military and civil service; 5. exemption from the payment of taxes for a varying period of years, depending upon the place of settlement and type of occupation; 6. free religious practice, and to those who founded agricultural colonies the right to build and control their own schools and churches, but not monasteries; 7. the right to proselyte among the Mohammedans;[19] 8. the right of local self-government for those who founded agricultural communities; 9. the right of every family to import free of duty its belongings as well as goods for sale to the value of 300 rubles; and 10. to those who established factories with their own capital the right to buy serfs and peasants.[20]

The third act of July 22 prescribed in greater detail the duties of the Bureau of Guardianship and appropriated for its use the annual sum of 200,000 rubles.[21]

Other supplementary legislation soon followed. Of this the most important was a law of March 19, 1764, which defined the territory to be settled on the Lower Volga; specified that colonists of different faiths were to settle in separate districts to forestall religious wrangling; allocated to every family thirty desiatins of land; stipulated that only the youngest son could inherit the land of a colonist; and finally stated that the land was the inalienable property of the whole village and the individual colonist or his descendants could never sell, mortgage, or subdivide it.[22]

As in the case of the December Manifesto, the new laws provided no special machinery for the recruitment of colonists. The diplomatic representatives were again furnished with copies of the new Manifesto, instructed to publish it in the newspapers and to distribute separate copies. Due to the fact, however, that this sec-

---

18 *P. S. Z.*, XVI, No. 11 879.

19 The colonists were even permitted to enslave the Mohammedans. Proselyting among Orthodox Russians, however, was strictly prohibited.

20 *P. S. Z.*, XVI, No. 11 880.

21 *Ibid.*, No. 11 881.

22 *Ibid.*, No. 12 095.

ond appeal promised extensive rights and privileges, a number of European countries, Austria in particular,[23] which themselves were fostering immigration, not only strictly forbade its publication, but also placed very severe penalties on those who attempted to emigrate or persuaded others to do so.[24] Under such circumstances Count D. M. Golitsyn, the Russian minister in Vienna, did not attempt to publish the Manifesto in the Austrian papers. Individual copies of it nevertheless found their way into that country, for J. Simolin, the Russian representative to the Imperial Diet in Regensburg, managed to send German translations of it as special supplements to foreign papers read in Austria.[25] The same procedure was followed in the case of Prussia, another country which strictly prohibited emigration.

In the case of France, too, it was found impossible to publish the Russian appeal for colonists in the newspapers. The Imperial government nevertheless urged its minister in Paris to make known the privileges offered to foreigners by one means or another. In particular it asked him to get in touch with a group of Protestants who had applied to the British government for permission to settle in the American colonies, but had not yet received an affirmative reply.[26] Count K. A. Golitsyn therefore distributed separate copies of the manifesto all over France. This step only increased the vigilance of the French police and made it next to impossible for prospective emigrants to leave the country.[27]

Similar opposition to the publication of the Russian invitation for colonists was encountered in Sweden; while in Turkey, where Catherine meant to appeal to the Christians, particularly the Greeks, the distribution of printed copies was thought inadvisable, because of the permission granted to foreign colonists not only to proselyte among the Mohammedans in Russia, but also to enslave them.[28]

---

[23] Beheim-Schwarzbach, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

[24] In view of this the Russian ministers were instructed on November 28, 1763, to concentrate their efforts upon countries which did not forbid emigration, and in others to center their activity upon foreigners living there and upon natives only in so far as this was possible without discrediting themselves. *Sbornik,* LI, 126-127.

[25] Pisarevsky, *Inostrannaia kolonizatsia,* p. 69.

[26] Rescript of the Chancellor to Count K. A. Golitsyn, October 24, 1763; *Sbornik,* LI, 55-56.

[27] The French minister in Russia also did his best to discredit the whole colonization scheme by sending to his government highly colored reports of the reception of the colonists and their serious condition on the Volga. Cf. "Correspondance Diplomatique des Représentants de France a la cour de l 'Imperatrice Catherine II., 1766-1769," *Ibid.,* CXLI, 49-50, 83, 99, 119-120, 134, 141-142, 158-159, 324.

[28] Catherine had no objection to the bringing in of Mohammedan colonists. When in November of 1763 a rich Persian asked for permission to bring 3,000 of his

In England and in Holland the Russian diplomats apparently encountered no difficulty in publishing the second manifesto. However, conditions here were relatively so much better than in most of the continental countries that there was little or no incentive to emigrate to Russia. Besides both the Englishmen and the Dutch had colonies of their own to which to emigrate.

Thus the only countries where the Russian representatives met no obstacles in making known the colonization policy of its government and where they could openly and successfully recruit colonists were the small states of southern and western Germany.[29] And in these tyranny, extravagance, corruption, and religious intolerance had already produced widespread discontent and fostered the desire for emigration. The activities of English shipowners and the immigration agents of other foreign governments had kept their interest in emigration alive. The appeal of the Russian government therefore fell upon well-prepared ground.

Though the rights and privileges granted to foreign settlers were very extensive, the number of people who responded to the Russian call was very small. This was due chiefly to the inadequacy of the Russian recruiting machinery, for the newspaper and the distribution of broadsides were practically the only means of the diplomatic agents to reach prospective colonists. Many of the diplomatic representatives soon began to complain to the govern-

---

countrymen to Russia as colonists, Catherine wrote to Panin: "La colonie des trois mille Perses me réjouirait beaucoup, faites un peu en sorte que le Collège donne au plus tôt son avis." *Ibid.*, LI, 215.

29 This reveals the absurdity of the contention that the predominance of the Germans among the foreign colonists was due to Catherine's German origin. For example Evans Lewin, *The German Road to the East: An Account of the 'Drang nach Osten' and the Teutonic Aims in the Near and Midale East* (London, 1917), p. 298 says: "But when a German princess ruled over the destinies of the Russian Empire . . . the first wave of German immigration was set in motion. . . ." And on page 300: ". . . It was Catherine's deliberate policy to introduce into the as yet but partly civilized Baltic provinces and in other portions of Russia a leaven of German settlers to counteract the disruptive tendencies of the disaffected peasantry." And Dr. Manfred Langhans-Ratzeburg, *Die Wolgadeutschen* (Berlin, 1929), p. 1 says ". . . Kaiserin Katharina II, eine deutsche Princessin . . . [schrieb] einen Aufruf (Manifesto), in dem sie Ausländer aller Völker, ausser Juden, zur Ansiedlung in Russland aufforderte and hierbei wohl hauptsächlich ihre deutschen Landsleute im Auge hatte . . . ." Cf. also Sergei Shelu Khin, *Nemetskaia Kolonizatsia na iuge Rossii* (Odessa, 1915), pp. 24, 28-29.

Equally erroneous is the claim, made over and over by German writers on the subject, namely, that the numerical superiority of the German element among the foreign settlers was due to Catherine's belief in the superiority of the German peasants as colonizers. For example, Hans von Eckardt, *Russia* (New York, 1932), p. 86 states: "In this connection she had in view chiefly German colonists, to whom she looked for model agricultural methods. . . ." Cf. also Dr. Karl Lindeman, *Von den deutschen Kolonisten in Russland* (Stuttgart, 1924), pp. 56-57 and A. M. Resis, "Landsleute im Osten," *Das Grössere Deutschland*, XLIX (December 4, 1915), 1614.

ment against this newly imposed task which made their position rather delicate, not only in countries which prohibited emigration, but also in many which had no laws against it. "My position in this matter has become so delicate," writes Count Golitsyn from Paris, "that Your Majesty will scarcely believe the precautionary measures I have to take in order to carry out the commission imposed upon me and at the same time not to compromise my official status as well as the respect of the court."[30]

The government finally realized the inadequacy of such an arrangement and in the summer of 1764 decided to follow the example of other European countries in this matter, that is, to employ professional agents. As soon as this decision became known the Russian embassies in Central Europe and the Bureau of Guardianship at home were swamped with offers of their services from agents who either were or had been similarly employed by other European powers. Of these agents whose services the government engaged, the following were the most important: Karl Meixner, with headquarters at Ulm; Johann Facius, stationed at Frankfort-on-Main; and a certain Filippovich, whose center of activity was the Balkans. These three men received salaries and collected colonists directly for the crown. Hence they were known as "crown agents" and the colonists they supplied as "crown colonists".[31] The Russian minister at Regensburg J. Simolin, supervised the activity of these men. The government also engaged the services of a certain Baron Caneau de Beauregard and of two recruiting companies: one composed of de Bauve,[32] Meusnier de Précourt and Quentin Benjamin Coulhette d'Hauterive, and the other of Pictet and Le Roy. These were known as *Vyzevatels,* i. e. "Callers."[33]

The new recruiting machinery was not slow in producing abundant results. The crown agents, and especially the numerous agents of the *Vyzevatels,* now overran the towns and the countryside of southern and southwestern Germany, proclaiming everywhere the generous offer of the Russian government. Besides the printed

---

30 Pisarevsky, *Inostrannaia kolonizatsia,* p. 71.

31 The contracts with Meixner and Facius are reprinted in *ibid.,* app., pp. 11-14.

32 Also spelled de Boffe.

33 The conditions upon which they contracted to supply colonists were briefly: their colonists were to receive the same amount of land as the crown colonists; for every 100 families the *Vyzevatel* was to receive thrice the amount of land granted to one family; each *Vyzevatel* was to be granted a loan of 4,000 rubles, payable in ten years, and a present of 350 rubles for the building of a house; their colonists were to enjoy the same rights and privileges as the crown colonists; finally, the *Vyzevatels* were to have administrative and police powers in their colonies. Cf. "Contrat entre la chancellerie de tutelle des étrangeres et le baron Caneau de Beauregard," *Ibid.,* app., pp. 1-6.

copies of the July Manifesto the *Vyzevatels* also issued and distributed on their own account numerous broadsides. Some of these gave the names and places of restaurants and hotels where free board and lodging were furnished to anyone who decided to emigrate to Russia.[34] Others extolled the fertility of the soil, the beauty of the climate, and the low cost of living in the Volga region.[35] Still others appealed to German wanderlust and desire for adventure by emphasizing the fact that here was a chance to get a free trip to a distant country and to see the strangest peoples.

Small wonder that these exaggerated statements and promises created a veritable emigration fever in the petty German states.[36] This fever the agents kept up with plenty of beer and whiskey. Since the profits of the *Vyzevatels* depended entirely upon the number of colonists, not their quality, they resorted to all kinds of tricks to induce people to emigrate[37] or to seduce each other's colonists.

---

34 E. G.: Wem noch unbekannt, dass Ihro Russisch Kayserliche Majestät Leute, so nehmlich Profehsion oder Ackerwerk verstehen, annehmen lahsen; So wird dieses hiemit bekannt gemacht. Zu Rohslau bei Dehsau im Schwarzen Bären werden sie Verpflegung erhalten, auch wird vor alles bestens gesorgt werden. Nehmlich der Gastwirth Hoffmann bezahlet jedem Mann täglich vier Groschen, der Frau zwei Groschen sechs Pfennige, auf jedes Kind täglich ein Groschen sechs Pfennige, dabei frei Quartier und Transport, ingleichen werden ledige Frauenspersonen zur Verheurathung verlanget und angenommen, es muss sich aber ein jedes bald möglichst daselbst einfinden, weil der Commissarius binnen 4 Wochen nach Sankt Petersburg angehet. Geschrieben den 12. April 1766.—Quoted in G. Beratz, *Die deutschen Kolonien an der unteren Wolga in ihrer Entstehung und ersten Entwickelung* (Saratov, 1915), p. 38.

35 The following is a typical example: "Aussicht derjenigen Vortheile, so bey der im Russischen Reich neu zu errichtenden Colonie anzutreffen sind." It reads in part: . . . Der Ort, wo sich diese Colonie befindet, bietet zu dem Landbau sowol, als zu der Handlung, die man allda errichten will, die glücklichste Lage an. Er ist in dem mittägigen Theile Russlands, und zwar an dem Flusse Wolga, in dem Königreich Astracan, gelegen; eine Luftgegend, die derjenigen von Frankreich in nichts nachgiebt, was die Mässigkeit und Fruchtbarkeit des Erdreichs anbelangt, es sey an Wein, Getreide, Wiesenwachs, Holz und fischreichen Flüssen.

Kann man an dessen Ueberfluss zweifeln, da selbst diejenigen, die schon dahin übergegangen sind, gestehen, dass allda zwey Pfund Weizen-Mehl einen halben französischen Sol, und das Rind-Kalb und Hammelfleisch nur einen Sol kostet? Die Fische, das Federvieh, Milchspeisen und Zugemüse sind fast umsonst zu bekommen. . . . Zweitens . . . werden ihnen fünfzig Morgen Land nach französischen Maass . . . zum Genuss gegeben, um ihnen die jenige Gemächlichkeit zu verschaffen, die ein ehrlicher Mann haben sollte . . . . Drittens, die Häuser, Werkzeuge, der Vorrath und Vieh sowohl, als die zum Ackerbau nothwendigen Materialien, werden ihnen von den Vorgesetzten der Colonie verschafft, deren Betrag ohne Zinsen nur erst nach Verlauf von zehn Jahren wieder erstattet werden soll. . . . Quoted in Pisarevsky, *op. cit.*, app., pp. 6-8.

36 The *Vyzevatels* had agents in France and in Austria also. They had small success in France, for most of the agents had police records and before long the majority of them landed in the Bastille. In Austria they had somewhat better luck, for among the Volga colonists were a number with passports to Hungary, but who had preferred and managed to go to Russia.

37 One favorite method was to make the Germans sign French contracts and the non-German emigrants German contracts. Thus they often did not know what they had promised to do or not to do.

In view of these methods of the agents as well as the extensiveness of the privileges granted, and bearing in mind the political, social, and economic conditions in these German states, one can readily imagine what type of people responded to the call. At best not more than half of the colonists were farmers. Next in point of numbers came artisans, tradesmen, and ex-soldiers, followed by impoverished noblemen, students, barbers, fugitives from justice, drunkards, and others of ill-repute.[38]

This motley crowd was taken in groups of various sizes to Lübeck, Hamburg and a few other ports and thence transported in Hanseatic and English ships to Kronstadt. From here the colonists were taken to Oranienbaum and to other villages near St. Petersburg, to be quartered there until each of them should have selected the place of his future abode. Here many of them saw their dreams of a paradise shattered. Contrary to the express provisions of the July Manifesto and the reiterated assurances of the agents that every immigrant would be entirely free to follow his profession wherever he pleased, the representatives of the Guardianship Office now compelled everyone of them to take up agriculture. With the exception of some 3,000 immigrants, who in 1765 and 1766 established six colonies in the province of St. Petersburg, two in Livland, six in Chernigov, and one in Voronezh,[39] about 22,800 of them (6,342 families)[40] were sent to the Lower Volga. Here were founded 104 colonies between 1764-1767, of which number Beauregard established twenty-seven on the left bank of the Volga, Pictet and Le Roy twenty-five on the same side of the river, and de Bauve, Précourt and d'Hauterive eleven on the right bank. The remaining forty-one were crown colonies, thirty-three of which were located on the right bank, and eight on the left bank of the Volga.[41]

The condition of the Volga colonies was almost hopeless from the beginning. The reasons for this were manifold. A large number of the colonists knew nothing of farming and stoutly resisted every effort of the government to make farmers out of them. The inevitable consequences were want and starvation, though the government made great efforts to relieve the plight of the colonists. To make matters worse they also suffered terrible depredations

---

38 G. Bonwetsch, *Geschichte der deutschen Kolonien an der Wolga* (Stuttgart, 1919), pp. 28-29. A. Klaus, *Nashi kolonii* (St. Petersburg, 1869), app. I, 1-8.

39 *Ibid.*, app., II, 20-22.

40 Pisarevsky, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

41 These colonists came chiefly from Hesse, the Rhineland, Wuerttemberg, Alsace, Saxony and Bavaria, a few hundred from France, and an insignificant number from Switzerland, Italy, Sweden and Poland.

at the hands of the Kalmyks and the Kirghis. The latter between 1771-1774 destroyed seventeen colonies, of which many were never rebuilt. Several thousand people were killed or taken captive and sold as slaves in Central Asia.[42] The situation became desperate when in 1774 Pugachev swept plundering and burning through the entire Lower Volga region. Disappointed in their hopes of finding an eldorado in Russia, a number of the colonists joined the rebels.[43]

The notorious corruption of the local authorities was another factor which kept the new colonies from developing normally. The establishment of the Volga colonies cost the government over 5,000,000 rubles,[44] a very large share of which went into the pockets of the local officials.[45] The mismanagement in the *Vyzevatel* colonies in particular was so flagrant, and the demand of their colonists to be freed from the exactions of the "Directors"[46] so insistent, that the government in 1779 was forced to take over the *Vyzevatel* colonies.[47]

A very large share of the blame for the scandalous conditions in the colonies during Catherine's reign must be ascribed to the government itself. As with so many of her projects, the plan of colonization was conceived in too ambitious proportions. The details of the plan had not been worked out at all. Again it is difficult to comprehend why all the foreigners were forced to take up farming, irrespective of whether they were fitted for it or not.[48] But the height of folly was reached when the government put army officers in charge of the colonists to teach them methods of farming, forbade the practise of any trade, and in general through the "Instruction" of 1768 inaugurated a regime which came dangerously near to the establishment of serfdom in the colonies.[49]

---

42 Beratz, *op. cit.*, pp. 170-216. V. Schirmunski, *Die deutschen Kolonien in der Ukraine* (Charkow, 1928), p. 18.

43 The question as to the number of the colonists who joined Pugachev has been the subject of much acrimonious writing. Pre-revolutionary Volga German writers have always minimized it, while the nationalist press grossly exaggerated it. Cf. A. Dunin, "Nemtsy v Samarskoi steppi," *Istoricheskii Vestnik* (November, 1915), 543-558.

44 A. A. Velitsyn, *Nemtsy v Rossii* (St. Petersburg, 1893), p. 116.

45 Klaus, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

46 As the *Vyzevatels* were known in their administrative and police capacity.

47 Pisarevsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-203 and app., pp. 47-67.

48 It is possible that this was done for strategic reasons, for a storm was already brewing beyond the Volga. Cf. V. S. Ikonnikov, *Znachenie tsarstvovania Ekateriny* II. (Kiev, 1897), p. 20.

49 Beratz, *op. cit.*, pp. 119-136. See also G. Pisarevsky, *Khoziaistvo i forma zemlevladenia v koloniakh Povolzhia v XVIII-m i v pervoi chetverti XIX-go veka* (Rostov-on-Don, 1916).

The lack of ships for the transportation of the colonists assembled at Hamburg and Lübeck,[50] and the chaotic conditions in the colonies, prompted the government in November, 1766 to give up its colonization policy temporarily. For the next decade Catherine was completely occupied with the affairs in Poland, her first war with Turkey, and finally the Pugachev rebellion. But once the revolt had been suppressed and peace concluded with Turkey, the question of colonization came to the fore again. This time the main current of colonists was to be directed to New Russia. Since it is this region with which this study of Mennonite colonization is primarily concerned it is important here to interrupt our story and give a brief description of the location and extent of this territory, its physical geography, soils, climate and the inhabitants which were present when the Mennonites appeared on the scene.[51]

Location and Extent of New Russia

The term New Russia, as distinct from that of South Russia, refers to a specific and delimited part of the northern hinterland of the Black Sea region. The term came into general use during the reign of Catherine II. and was applied to the territory which she and her predecessor, Elizabeth, had wrested from the Turks and the Zaporozhian Cossacks.[52] Roughly it comprised that region which subsequently formed the extreme southern portions of the governments (provinces) of Kiev, Chernigov, Poltava, Kharkov and Voronezh, the eastern part of the Don oblast, and the entire subsequent governments of Kherson, Tavrida, and Ekaterinoslav. The territory was administered during Catherine's time by a viceroy (Potemkin) and later on by a governor-general, residing in Odessa. The boundaries of New Russia were frequently changed during the closing years of the eighteenth and the first years of the nineteenth centuries, as new administrative subdivisions were either carved out of it or added to it. But after the final incorporation of Bessarabia in 1878, it comprised that province and those of Kher-

---

[50] Thus 13,000 colonists were at one time in 1766 waiting in Lübeck to be shipped to Russia.

[51] This account is based primarily upon V. P. Semenov-Tian-Shansky, ed., *Rossia. Polnoe geograficheskoe opisanie nashego otechestva.* Vol. XIV, *Novorossia i Krym* (St. Petersburg, 1910), pp. 1-163; Vladimir P. Timoshenko, *Agricultural Russia and the Wheat Problem* (Stanford University, 1932), pp. 3-17; Stephen Rudnitsky, *Ukraine, the Land and Its People.* An Introduction to its Geography (New York City, 1918), pp. 3-99.

[52] The Zaporozhian Cossacks had their headquarters on the lower reaches of the Dnieper, below the rapids. The name *Zaporozhian* was derived from the words *za,* which means below or behind, and *porogi,* meaning rapids.

son, Tavrida, and Ekaterinoslav, and the Don oblast, an area of approximately 410,000 square miles.

Physical Geography of New Russia

The region under consideration consists of one continuous low plain, traversed in the middle by one main group of undulating plateaus, running from the northwest to the southeast. Only in the south is this plain, commonly called steppe, bordered by the low Yaila mountain system of the southern coast of the Crimean peninsula. The surface of this steppe is very flat, here and there furrowed by deep picturesque river valleys and divided into innumerable low plateaus by rain water-rifts, called *balkas*.

The river system of New Russia is concentrated in the Black Sea. The most important rivers are the Dniester, the Southern Bug, the Ingul, Dnieper and the Don. There are also a number of so-called steppe-rivers, like the Tiligul, Kuialnik, Molochnaia, and others, but all of these end their courses in lagoons and contain very little water during the summer. Owing to the level character of the land, the rivers in New Russia are slow-moving and navigable, except where they cross the main group of plateaus and where they form rapids. The valleys of these rivers are broad and in many places swampy, covered by so-called *plavni,* that is, wooded banks which during the spring floods are under water.

The Soils

The soils of the steppe are of two main kinds: black soils and brown soils. The black soils (*chernozem*) are the best for agriculture since they are very rich in humus content. They cover practically all of New Russia, with the exception of a narrow belt along the coast of the Black Sea, the Sea of Azov, and the Crimean peninsula. The humus content of the black soils is highest (seven per cent) in the northern part of New Russia and decreases toward the south, where the so-called chocolate variety of black soil prevails. The soils along the coasts and the non-mountainous part of the Crimea are for the most part of the chestnut variety, while in the neighborhood of the rivers it is light-brown. Both the chestnut and the light-brown soils belong to the group of brown soils. They are less rich in humus content than the black soils, the chestnut variety containing about three per cent and the light-brown less than two per cent of humus.

The Climate

The climate of New Russia, with the exception of the southern slopes of the Crimean mountains, is decidedly continental. The

average July temperature is about plus 20 C. and the average January temperature about minus 7 C. The yearly averages fluctuate between plus 6 and plus 9 C., except on the southern coast of the Crimea where the yearly average rises to plus 13 C.

The precipitation all over New Russia is very light, because the Atlantic ocean is too distant and the Black Sea is of only local significance. The average precipitation is about fourteen inches, rising in a few places to about sixteen inches. This deficiency in rainfall is further aggravated by the very hot summers and the presence of little snow in the winter. Fortunately the distribution of precipitation among the seasons is favorable in that the rainiest months are May, June, and July, the month with the largest amount of rainfall being June. Accordingly, the precipitation is greatest in those months which are most important for vegetation. Unfortunately however, these summer rains fall generally in the form of very heavy showers, and since there are few wooded areas in this region, the water flows off and evaporates before it is able to thoroughly saturate the ground. Thus in spite of its excellent soils, New Russia frequently suffers serious or total crop-failures due to drought.

The Population

New Russia, located as it is on the northern shores of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, at the point where the easiest overland route connects the continents of Europe and Asia, has been traversed from the hoary past by numerous hordes of Asiatics, who overran Europe from this point. Goths, Huns, Avars, Khazars, Pechenegs, Polovtsy and Tatars infested this region in succession, devastating it and exterminating the Slavic inhabitants. Only during the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth centuries, when Cossacks established their strongholds on the Don and the Dnieper, did the Slavs begin to reconquer the region. The struggle over its possession (excepting Bessarabia) came to a final conclusion with the Russian annexation of the Crimea in 1783.

The population in the newly conquered territory, excepting chiefly the coastal region of the Crimea which was fairly thickly populated by Tatars and a liberal sprinkling of Greeks and Armenians, was extremely sparse. Practically the only inhabited districts were the Cossack settlements on the Dnieper and the Don, and the military colonies of Novo-Serbia and Slaviano-Serbia, the former located in the southern part of the Kiev province and the latter near Bakhmut and Lugansk (in subsequent Ekaterinoslav province).[53]

[53] Cf. Footnote 3 above.

Scattered here and there were also settlements of escaped serfs and fugitives from justice, while in the vicinity of the coasts roamed a considerable number of Nogais, a nomadic tribe of Tatars.

Potemkin, upon his appointment in 1774 as viceroy of New Russia, embarked immediately upon a feverish policy of colonizing the desolate country. One of the government's first acts was to distribute large sections of the public domain to court favorites, army officers, government officials, but especially to large land-owners with the condition of settling a certain number of serfs on the land. This act caused an immediate serious conflict with the Zaporozhian Cossacks. The latter claimed title to all the land between the Bug river in the west and the Kalmius stream, flowing into the Sea of Azov, in the east, and resisted strenuously all efforts to colonize that land. At the same time they did everything in their power to lure the serfs from the newly established estates and the soldiers from the frontier posts to come and live with them. To do away with this menace as well as to square accounts for previous misdeeds of the Zaporozhians, the government in 1775 despatched a large army to destroy their stronghold on the Dnieper. A large number of the Cossacks were transferred to the Kuban, while the remainder, preferring Turkish rule, established their new head-quarters on the Danube. With the Cossack danger removed, the government proceeded with its policy of distributing the land to court favorites and large land owners. It also transferred a large number of State peasants from Central Russia and settled them on the Lower Dnieper.

Simultaneously with this process of settling native Russians, Potemkin was also eagerly looking around for colonists from abroad. This time the field of operation for the Russian recruiting agents was still further limited than in the sixties; for at that time their operations in Southern and Western Germany had been so successful that those states had enacted numerous laws prohibiting emigration. Potemkin, consequently, had to look elsewhere for colonists. His agents now visited Danzig, the island of Dagoe in the Baltic, the island of Minorca in the Mediterranean, Albania, the coastal towns of Italy, the northern regions of the Caucasus, the Greek and Armenian settlements in the Crimea; in short, every place where there was discontent and a prospect of recruiting at least a few colonists for New Russia. It is impossible here to take up in detail all of Potemkin's colonization schemes and we shall confine ourselves, therefore, to a brief review of the most important colonies established by him in New Russia.

The Greek and Armenian Colonists

Affairs in the Crimea in 1778 were drifting from bad to worse. Shagin Girei, elevated to the throne of the Khanate with the help of Russian bayonets, was driving his opponents into open rebellion through his cruel persecutions. To keep its puppet and his party in power, Russia had to despatch an army into the Crimea. The Christian population in the peninsula, in whose hands was concentrated nearly all industry and agriculture, had suffered particularly from these and previous disorders and were preparing to emigrate. Potemkin, upon hearing this, immediately instructed the commander of the Russian army of occupation, Count Prosorovsky, to do everything possible to persuade the Christians to settle in Russian territory, offering them in general the same rights and privileges which had been granted to the Volga Germans.[54] The result was that 31,386 Christians left the Crimea during the fall of 1778, of whom 15,971 were city and 15,415 rural people.[55] The Greeks, who comprised about three-fourths of the immigrants, were settled on the shore of the Sea of Azov where they founded the town of Mariupol and twenty colonies while the Armenians founded the town of Nakhichevan on the Don and five farming communities.[56]

Founding of the Swedish Colony

In 1780 Count Stenbock sold his estate Roeicks, located on the island of Dagoe in the Baltic to an Estonian landowner, Ungern. In view of the impending sale Stenbock had served notice to his Swedish tenants to leave the estate by March 1, 1781. The tenants, not knowing where to go, appealed to the Russian government for a place of settlement. Potemkin, ever on the outlook for fresh colonists, asked the government to send the Swedes to New Russia. The request was granted. In the meantime the Swedes had succeeded in signing contracts with the new owner of the estate. Potemkin, however, had already despatched a certain Colonel Sinelnikov to supervise the journey of the Swedes southward. To the latter's protestations that they were content to stay on the island, Sinelnikov argued that they had signed the contract with the new owner only because they had no better place to go and proceeded at once to "impress" them with the superior advantages offered them by Potemkin. Sinelnikov's argument prevailed and in August,

---

[54] Cf. *P. S. Z.*, XX, Nos. 14, 942 and 14, 943.

[55] N. Dubrovin, *Prisoedinenie Kryma k Rossii* (St. Petersburg, 1885), II, 634-637 and 710-714.

[56] Skalkovsky, *op. cit.*, I, 138.

1781 a group of 960 people started their trek southward under a convoy of soldiers, arriving at Berislav, the place selected for their settlement, in May, 1782. Here they established a colony called Staro-Shvedskaia, or Gammal Svenskby.

The settlement had a sorrowful history. A large number of the settlers were fishermen and knew nothing of farming. Disease played havoc with them. By the turn of the century only 148 souls were left of the original number.[57] To replace the colonists who had died Potemkin in 1783 settled in this colony thirty-eight Corsican families, the majority of whom soon ran away. To save the colony from utter ruin the government in 1800 remitted certain taxes, granted the same privileges as were given the other colonists,[58] and finally in 1804 established three German colonies in the neighborhood of the Swedes, with the purpose of teaching the latter how to make the soil of the steppe yield.

The Danzig Colonists

After the First Partition of Poland the Free City of Danzig was completely surrounded by Prussian territory. Prussia, frustrated in its desire to have the city included in its share of the spoils, now took a series of measures designed to cripple Danzig's commerce. It imposed such a high tariff upon Polish exports and imports through Danzig that trade was diverted to Prussian ports, principally Elbing and Königsberg.[59] Such a state of affairs naturally hit hardest the poorer citizenry of the Free City. Accordingly, when on July 14, 1785 Catherine issued a new appeal to foreigners,[60] many of them addressed themselves to the Russian representative in Danzig, asking him to help them to go to Russia. As soon as Potemkin heard of this he concluded in 1786 a contract with a certain Georg von Trappe for recruiting colonists in Danzig. Von Trappe began his campaign on June 19, 1786 and in a short time had recruited 247 families. Since the emigration of these families would deprive the city of a supply of cheap labor, the magistrates ordered Trappe out of town. Only after repeated threats of reprisals on the part of Russia did he succeed in despatching a considerable number of those prospective immigrants to Riga. Of these immigrants the majority found employment in towns, and

---

57 D. Bagalei. *Kolonizatsia Novorossiiskago kraia i pervye shagi ego po puti kultury* (Kiev, 1889), pp. 90-91.

58 *P. S. Z.*, XXVI, No. 19, 372.

59 Otto Hintze, *Die Hohenzollern und ihr Werk* (Berlin, 1915), p. 391.

60 *P. S. Z.*, XXII, No. 16, 226.

only twenty-one families settled on land, establishing the colony of Old Danzig, in Kherson province.[61]

The Khortitsa Mennonite Colonies

About the same time that the Danzig colonists left for Russia, two men called the attention of the Russian government to the Mennonites in and around Danzig. One of these men was Count Rumiantsev-Zadunaisky, who during the course of the Seven Years War had been many times through the Mennonite settlements in the vicinity of Danzig and had been greatly impressed by the state of their farming.[62] He thought that the scarcity of land in that region would soon compel the Mennonites to look for another country in which to settle and that therefore it might not be difficult to persuade them to come to Russia. The other man who called Potemkin's attention to the Mennonites was Trappe, who knew that both in Danzig and in Prussian territory the position of the Mennonites was rapidly becoming untenable because of heavy taxation, shortage of available land and various other disabilities. He believed that an invitation from the Russian government would find a ready response among them. Such an invitation was extended in August, 1786[63] and between 1789-1797 about 350 families emigrated to New Russia, where they founded a number of colonies on the Lower Dnieper, called the Khortitsa settlement.[64]

The Bulgarian Colonists

Catherine's second war with Turkey in 1791 was responsible for a large migration of Christians, chiefly Bulgarians, from beyond the Danube to Bessarabia. Ninety-one Armenian families settled at Novo-Dubosary, and a number of Bulgarians established nineteen colonies in Southern Bessarabia. Other Bulgarians were taken farther inland, because Potemkin feared that they might return to Turkey.[65]

Two other colonizing schemes of Potemkin and Catherine deserve to be mentioned briefly. The first concerned the settling of English convicts in New Russia. Potemkin, always concerned about the increase of population in his beloved New Russia, persuaded

---

[61] J. Stach, *Ocherki, iz istorii i sovremennoi zhizni iuzhnorusskikh kolonistov* (Moscow, 1916), pp. 31-32. Hereafter referred to as Stach, *Iuzhnorusskie kolonisty.*

[62] Skalkovsky, *Istoria Novorossiiskago kraia,* I, 183-184.

[63] Heinrich Epp, *Die Chortitzer Mennoniten* (Odessa, 1889), p. 2.

[64] S. Bondar, *Sekta mennonitov v Rossii* (Petrograd, 1916), pp. 14-19. Pisarevsky, *Inostrannaia kolonizatsia,* pp. 335-337.

[65] *Ibid.,* pp. 338-340. A. Skalkovsky, *Bolgarskia kolonii v Bessarabii i Novorossiiskom krae* (Odessa, 1848), pp. 12-13, 65-74.

Catherine to instruct the Russian representative at the Court of St. James to enter into an informal agreement with the British government whereby English convicts should be sent to Russia. Accordingly Chancellor Count Bezborodko, in a letter of October 28, 1785 informed Count Vorontsov, the Russian minister in England that if the English government would be willing to bear the expense of shipping those convicts to Riga or Reval, the Russian government would be glad to settle them in Tavrida.[66] Count Vorontsov, however, categorically refused to have anything to do with such a project, for, as he said in a letter to Count Panin, . . . que dirait le monde quand on verrait que l'exil et la punition de tous les scélérats de l'Europe était le transport en Russie sous le régne de la Grande Catherine?[67] Nothing therefore came of the scheme.

A second plan originated in the desire of the Empress to help the French émigrées. Condé's army was in a desperate plight after the inglorious failure of the invasion to restore the ancient régime. Catherine proposed that Condé bring his army of about 6,000 men to Russia and establish two military colonies on the shores of the Sea of Azov, for which purpose 630,000 desiatins of land would be set aside. The Empress also offered him very extensive privileges for his men and officers.[68] But as Condé and his army had not yet given up all hope of restoring the monarchy, they were unwilling to accept the offer.[69]

The Colonization Policy of Alexander I.

Alexander I. continued to found colonies of foreigners in New Russia; but in order to rectify the shortcomings which had been so manifest in his predecessor's colonization policy, he issued an Ukaz on February 20, 1804, which provided a set of rules for the acceptance and establishment of colonists. According to these rules only such foreigners were to be accepted as were qualified to serve as examples in agriculture and related occupations, i. e. farmers, gardeners, vinedressers, stock-breeders, carpenters, coach- and harness-makers, saddlers, cobblers, and tailors. Only married people, preferably with children, were to be admitted and not more than

---

66 Count Bezborodko to Count Vorontsov, Oct. 28, 1785, *Arkhiv kniazia Vorontsova* XIII, letter No. 61.

67 Count Vorontsov to Count Panin, May 6, 1801, *Ibid.*, XI, 179.

68 Cf. "Plan pour l'organisation des colonies militaires françaises," *Sbornik* LIV, 201-204.

69 K. Miller, *Frantsuskaia emigratsia i Rossia v tsarstvovanie Ekateriny* II. (Paris, 1931), pp. 217-219.

200 families in any one year. The colonists were to be sent to Russia in groups of from twenty to thirty families. No one was to be persuaded to emigrate to Russia; rather should prospective colonists themselves apply at the Russian embassies or consular offices and produce evidence of their moral character, their ability as farmers, of having discharged all their obligations to the state and community they were leaving, and lastly of having 300 guldens or its equivalent in property. All colonists were to be settled in New Russia, where every farmer was to receive sixty desiatins of land. Moreover they were to enjoy the same rights and privileges that were granted earlier colonists, except that the period of exemption from taxes as well as the amount of travelling expenses were materially reduced.[70]

What a difference of principles underlay Alexander's colonization policy! It is this law of February 20, 1804, and its more or less faithful observance which provides the key to the enormous differences between the economic and cultural development of the New Russian colonists and the Volga Germans.[71] It would, of course, be far-fetched to assert that from now on only good farmers came as colonists to Russia. That was not the case, but on the whole they were quite superior to those of Catherine's time.

In 1810, when the country was in great financial straits, the government was compelled to curtail the large appropriations which thus far it had made for colonization purposes.[72] Therefore on February 25, 1810, the Russian embassies and consular agents were directed to announce to would-be colonists that henceforth no financial aid whatsoever would be extended, but that those who wished to settle in Russia at their own expense would be given the same quantity of land and granted the same privileges as were given on previous occasions.[73] Finally in 1819 the policy of bringing in foreign colonists en masse was given up entirely.[74] This restriction did not apply to the Mennonites, of whom 200 families were permitted to come in annually.[75] The exception was made "in view of the industriousness and the excellent state of farming prevalent among all the Mennonites in New Russia." Many exceptions to this pro-

---

70 *P. S. Z.*, XXVIII, No. 21, 163.

71 Cf. Georg Leibbrandt, *Die Auswanderung aus Schwaben nach Russland* 1816-1823 (Stuttgart, 1928), p. 110.

72 *P. S. Z.*, XXXI, No. 24, 131. Also N. Varadinov, *Istoria Ministerstva Vnutrennikh Del* (St. Petersburg, 1859), II, 85-86.

73 *P. S. Z.*, XXXI, No. 24, 131.

74 *Ibid.*, XXXVI, Nos. 27, 912 and 27, 954.

75 Bondar, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

hibition were subsequently made also in the case of certain Bulgarian and German colonies in order to complete the settlement of land originally set aside for colonists of those respective nationalities. Accordingly many of these colonists' settlements, begun during the first decade of the nineteenth century, were not completed until the 'thirties and 'forties.

The number of colonies established in New Russia after the inauguration of the new colonization policy is so large that it is impossible here to discuss them individually.[76] The most important of them are enumerated in the table below:[77]

Name of Settlement	Province	Uiezd	No. of colonies	Total am't of arable land (in desiat.)	Size of family allotment (in des.)
Molochnaia (Mennonite)	Tavrida	Berdiansk	57	116,576	65
Prischib (German)	"	Berdiansk	32	72,774	60
Neusatz (German)	"	Simferopol	4	6,143	60
Zürichtal (German)	"	Feodosia	4	3,583	60
Bogemka (Czech)	"	Perekop	4	8,060	46
Neuhoffnung (German)	"	Berdiansk	4	8,596	60
Berdiansk (Bulgarian)	"	Berdiansk	56	231,176	53
Mariupol (German)	Ekaterinoslav	Mariupol	27	46,299	60
Liebental (German)	Kherson	Odessa	11	45,231	60
Kuchurgan (German)	"	Odessa	6	26,647	60
Beresan (German)	"	Odessa	13	66,049	60
Glückstal (German)	"	Tiraspol	4	24,252	60
Bujalyk (Bulgarian)	"	Odessa	3	34,867	53
Sarat (German)	Bessarabia	Akkerman	3	15,660	60
Maloiaroslav (German)	"	Bendersk	11	52,802	60
Klöstitz (German)	"	Bendersk	10	60,715	60
Izmail (Bulgarian)	"	Akkerman	7	50,340	50
Nizhnebudzhak (Bulgarian)	"	Akkerman	19	116,020	50
Verkhnebudzhak (Bulgarian)	"	Bendersk	19	127,670	50
? (Jewish)	Kherson	Kherson	21	57,600	30
? (Jewish)	Ekaterinoslav	Mariupol	17	?	30
			332	1,071,060	

[76] They are discussed at some length in Klaus, *Nashi kolonii,* pp. 291-375 and app. II, 22-42; Skalkovsky, *Bolgarskia kolonii,* pp. 55-91; Dr. Karl Stumpp, *Die deutschen Kolonien im Schwarzmeergebiet* (Stuttgart, 1922), pp. 25-36; M. Shugurov, "Istoria Evreiev v Rossii," *Russkii Arkhiv,* V (May, 1894), p. 62 and V. V., "Evrei-zemledeltsy," *Vestnik Evropy,* CCXXXIV (July, 1905), pp. 112-138.

[77] The data are gathered from tables in Klaus, *op. cit.,* app. II, 22-42. Klaus makes numerous mistakes in computing the totals, which errors are corrected here.

THE RISE AND FALL OF THE ANABAPTISTS OF MUENSTER

JOHN HORSCH

Note.—The general significance of the Münster Anabaptists in literature is indicated in the editorial to this article. A fuller bibliographical account will be presented at the conclusion of this series.

The city of Münster, with a population of about 15,000, was the major city in the territory of Westphalia in northwestern Germany. The bishop of Münster was at the same time the civil ruler in his bishopric. The city enjoyed a large measure of self-government, however, under the sovereignty of the bishop. The government of the city was of a democratic nature, making radical changes possible at any time. The Craft- and Merchant-Guilds, seventeen in number, possessed great political power. They were united in a corporation whose governing body held regular sessions, each guild being represented by two men. The guilds were properly represented in the Council of the city; no important measure could be passed without their consent.

One of the priests of the city, Bernt Rothmann, began in 1530 to advocate non-Catholic doctrine. He visited Wittenberg, the headquarters of Lutheranism, in 1531, and thence went to Strasburg. Here he was a guest of the Zwinglian reformer, Wolfgang Capito, in whose house he also met Caspar Schwenckfeld. Upon his return to Münster he found great favor with the common people as an evangelical preacher. He held the office of priest in St. Maurice Church, just outside of the gates of the city. So great was the throng that desired to hear his sermons, that the church proved too small. Over night a pulpit was made for him outside of the church building. The Council gave him strict orders to preach only in St. Maurice Church, but Rothmann disregarded the command.

On January 7, 1532, the bishop of Münster outlawed Rothmann and in consequence he took refuge within the city. He addressed the bishop asserting his Catholic orthodoxy, but within a few weeks he published a confession in which he defended Lutheran doctrine. His confession contains a sentence to the effect that "a government which would desire to be considered Christian must punish false prophets," indicating that Rothmann did not advocate the principle of separation of church and state. Apparently he favored establishing a new state church.

On February 18 Rothmann began to preach just outside of St. Lambert's Church within the city, and on February 23 a great throng of people, led by Hermann Knipperdolling, Hermann Tilbeck and

others, demanded the keys of the church from the priest in charge and led Rothmann into the church. Henceforth he preached from the pulpit of St. Lambert's Church. One of the guilds of the city offered him one of their buildings for a residence. The guilds asked the authorities to work toward unity of faith, in the sense that the (Lutheran) doctrine, preached by Rothmann, should be recognized as the creed of the state. The bishop, on the other hand, demanded of the Council that the preacher of the new doctrine be banished. Rothmann received orders from the Council to desist from preaching, but did not obey them. Hermann Knipperdolling, a cloth merchant and a prominent member of the Council, supported him in his attitude of defiance against the commands of the Council. With Knipperdolling's consent a meeting of all the guilds was to be held upon Rothmann's demand on July 1, 1532. A formal covenant was drawn up and agreed upon for the protection of Rothmann and his doctrine against the opposing authorities of the city and of the state. The guilds demanded of the magistrates that nothing be done touching the pending questions without the consent of a committee of thirty-six men which they elected. In consequence the city Council promised on July 15 to protect Rothmann. On August 10 all the churches of the city with the exception of the cathedral were in possession of the evangelical party.

Franz of Waldeck, the bishop of Münster, did all that was in his power to restore Romanism in the city. He blockaded the streets leading to Münster. When word reached the citizens of Münster that the bishop was in conference with his principal counsellors in the town of Telgte, a sudden attack on him was planned through the instigation of Rothmann and Knipperdolling. A few hundred citizens of Münster surprised the canons and knights at Telgte on the night of December 25, 1532, and arrested all but a few of them. The bishop had on the previous day gone to the castle of Iburg. The counsellors of the bishop were led in triumph into the city and were held as hostages. They were not released until the bishop through the intervention of the Landgrave of Hesse consented to yield the city churches, except the cathedral, to the evangelical party.

In the month of August, 1532, Heinrich Roll, an evangelical minister, came to Münster from near-by Wassenberg in the northern part of the duchy of Cleve-Jülich in northwestern Germany. The Drost, or highest civil officer, of the county of Wassenberg, Werner von Palant, granted protection to all that were persecuted, hence a number of evangelical preachers besides Heinrich Roll, notably Johann Klopriss, Dionysius Vinne, Hermann Staprade and others

found an asylum in Wassenberg, until John III, Duke of Cleve-Jülich ordered the expulsion of those evangelical Christians who would not accept a somewhat revised order by which he expected to adjust the Catholic-evangelical issue within the old Church.

It should be observed that in the countries and cities, which discarded the Roman Catholic faith, the rulers decided for either Lutheranism or Zwinglianism and compelled all preachers to accept the creed which they adopted. Not so in the county of Wassenberg, however. Here for a short time the magistrates protected all men regardless of their faith. The authorities did not prescribe a definite creed. Hence there was here a doctrinal development that was neither along the lines followed by Luther nor was it altogether in unison with Zwinglian thought. The Wassenberg preachers agreed with Zwingli on the doctrine of the Lord's supper. They entertained doubts as to the scripturalness of infant baptism, as had also been the case with Zwingli before he decided upon a union of church and state.

Zwingli, in his early labors as a reformer, openly questioned the practice of infant baptism. He wrote in 1525: "A few years ago the error has misled me also that I considered it far better to baptize [not the infants but] the children after they have attained to a goodly age." When Zwingli realized that, if infant baptism was not retained, the state would not go hand in hand with the church and a state church (for which he meanwhile decided) was impossible, he began to defend this practice. But even after he had taken this position he wrote (in December 1524): "It must not be supposed that I care much for infant baptism . . . . If I should notice that infant baptism were not conducive to God's honor and to a Christian life, I should without hesitancy change my opinion."

Zwingli held that the introduction of believers' baptism is uncalled for, if the prosperity of the church is believed to be endangered by it. "If the matter is closely looked into, it will be seen that ye contend for vain outward things," he wrote to the Swiss Brethren who insisted on the practice of believers' baptism.[1] And again: "Should not infant baptism as well as all other outward things be discretely used or abandoned, whichever would be most conducive to the prosperity of the Christian Church?"[2]

Now this was virtually also the position of the Wassenbergers on the point in question. In later years Zwingli held that the abolition of infant baptism would be decidedly detrimental to the best interests of the Church, while the Wassenbergers were inclined to

[1] *Zwinglis Werke*, III, p. 406.
[2] *Ibid.*, IV, p. 328.

the opposite opinion. The prevailing difference between Zwingli and the Wassenbergers on this point was one of expediency rather than of principle. Another important point of agreement between Zwingli (in his earlier years) and the Wassenbergers was their emphasis on the importance of the illumination by the Holy Spirit.

For about three years some of the above named preachers labored in the country of Wassenberg, when Werner von Palant was taken to account for tolerating them. He lost his office. The preachers fled to Münster. To this city some of their number had gone even while persecution was not threatening them at Wassenberg. Heinrich Roll was the first of the Wassenberg preachers to come to Münster. When he arrived, in the summer of 1532, the evangelical party of the city was to all appearance a unit, although for some time it was known that Rothmann favored the Zwinglian view of the Lord's supper. Before the close of the year 1532 Rothmann openly defended the Zwinglian interpretation of the Lord's supper. Thus his reformatory interest assumed a still more definite form, and this was another indication of how strongly the former priest Rothmann had taken issue in the Luther-Zwingli disputation on the mass and what was to take its place from the biblical point of view. Consequently Martin Luther in a letter warned the magistrates of Münster against tolerating Zwinglianism and other heresy. The magistrates had it not in their power, however, to silence Rothmann. Thereafter the Lutheran standard was upheld in the city by the Syndic Johann von der Wieck. Thus a division took place in the evangelical party in Münster.

It has been said that Roll, at the time when he came to Münster, was virtually an Anabaptist, for the reason that he questioned the validity of infant baptism. But Zwingli also, as was shown above, for a time favored the abolition of infant baptism, and yet no one would class him with the Anabaptists. Neither did the Wassenberg preachers who came to Münster desire to be classed as such. Heinrich Slachtscaep (called Heinrich of Tongers), one of these preachers in a letter to Martin Butzer asserted that the Anabaptists in their doctrine of baptism insist too much on the letter of the Scriptures.[3] That Roll was not by any means considered an Anabaptist by Rothmann is evident from a letter written by the latter to the theologian Hermann von dem Busche. A few weeks after Roll had come to Münster, Rothmann who had become his friend, wrote: "I have already been called upon to deal with Anabaptists [undoubtedly Melchiorites]. They have left us now, but when they

[3] Cornelius, *Münsterische Aufruhr,* II, p. 348. Compare Rembert, *Wiedertäufer in Jülich,* p. 367, note.

went have threatened to return in greater force. However, if God be for us, who can be against us?"[4]

On March 3, 1533, the regular election of the city Council took place resulting in a defeat of the Roman Catholic party; not one of the representatives of the former national church were chosen. The majority of the Council were men of democratic tendencies who favored Rothmann and his party. The Wassenberg preachers came to Münster, as previously mentioned, between August, 1532 and February, 1533. They were given positions in some of the city churches. The newly elected Council, with the sanction of Rothmann and these preachers, published an *Order of Discipline* in which it was provided that those who speak disrespectfully of infant baptism should be taken account of by the authorities, a proof that neither Rothmann nor the Wassenbergers desired to make infant baptism a point at issue. There is good evidence to indicate that the Lutheran leader in the city, Johann von der Wieck, still entertained hopes to enlist Rothmann and all the evangelical preachers of Münster under the banner of Martin Luther. To Rothmann's mind this was, however, out of the question.

In the course of the year 1533 the division in the evangelical party in Münster became more and more pronounced. Those who rallied to the standard of von der Wieck were less democratic in sentiment than those who followed Rothmann's religious leadership. Rothmann, from the very beginning, owed his success to the people who had taken his part against "the powers that be," and he knew, if von der Wieck's party gained the victory, his days at Münster were numbered, unless he subscribed to the Lutheran creed. The goal of the Lutheran party was an exclusive Lutheran state-church, such as had been established in the Lutheran states and cities in which church and state were united and the citizenry had no other choice than to profess Lutheranism. Rothmann, on the other hand, believing the Lutheran doctrine on certain points to be unscriptural and depending largely on the common people for success, was inclined to emphasize the rights of the people.

About the month of May, 1533, Rothmann began to teach that infant baptism had no scriptural foundation. The new teaching, if carried into practice, meant in the last analysis, that state-churchism is indefensible. This teaching was so radical in nature that the Council objected. Rothmann now asserted the principle which Luther and Zwingli had emphasized in their early reformatory writings, namely, that such questions are for the Christian people to decide, not for the ecclesiastical or political authorities.

---

[4] Detmer, *Geschichtsquellen des Bistums Münster,* V, p. 190.

This procedure on Rothmann's declaration in regard to infant baptism served to widen the breach between his own friends and the party led by Johann von der Wieck. "It is amazing," wrote Rothmann in a letter dated June 2, 1533, "what plans the Lutherans have laid against us. But we are not afraid, for the blessing of the Lord will be with us."

In the summer of the same year the Council of the city and the heads of the guilds agreed that a great debate should be held between Rothmann and his friends on the one hand and leading Lutheran and Catholic theologians on the other, on the questions of baptism and the Lord's supper. In this debate which was held August 7 and 8, 1533, the principal spokesman of the Lutherans was Hermann von dem Busche, professor of theology at the university of Marburg in Hesse. His arguments defending infant baptism were met by Rothmann so ably and convincingly, that von dem Busche declared that time did not permit him to reply and he was moreover too fatigued to do so. The general impression prevailed that, from the infant baptist point of view, it was highly desirable to end the discussions. The debate was declared closed and the arguments of Rothmann against infant baptism were never answered.[5] The impression prevailed that the baptism of infants cannot be maintained on the authority of Scripture. In the opinion of the Council, however, there were weighty reasons against a change in the practice of baptism. The magistrates, at the close of the debate, gave strict orders to the preachers to baptize the infants as heretofore and to dissuade no one from this practice, but they found themselves powerless to enforce this decree. A few weeks later, namely, September 7, Hermann Staprade, one of the preachers of the city and Rothmann's friend, refused to baptize an infant that was brought to him for baptism.

The open opposition to infant baptism on the part of Staprade and his friends resulted apparently in strengthening the Lutheran party led by von der Wieck in the Council. The magistrates banished Staprade from the city and threatened Rothmann and all preachers who shared his views with the same measure if they dared to oppose the practice of infant baptism. The preachers in turn on September 17, wrote a letter to the Council, declaring that they could not obey the magistrates in such matters; it was the business of the church and not of the state to decide questions of this kind.

At the same time the preachers asked the guilds to protect them. The guilds procured from the Council permission for Rothmann to continue his labors as a preacher, but in view of the fact

[5] Detmer, *Das Religionsgespräch zu Münster,* etc., in *Monatshefte der Comenius—Gesellschaft,* 1900, pp. 273-300.

that even among the guilds there were those who did not favor the abolition of infant baptism, Rothmann, on October 3, 1533, gave a written declaration in which he promised, not to treat of baptism and the Lord's supper in his sermons, nor mention these points at all. "But I will teach" he pledged himself, "that which is conducive to peace and which will exonerate the honorable Council [from the suspicion that they tolerate the abolition of infant baptism]; I will teach that which will quiet down the common people, as it is at all times my duty to do, until the time when the matter may be made clearer to us and the Lord may grant further instruction and knowledge of the truth."[6]

On the ground of this declaration Rothmann was permitted to continue his pastorate at the church of St. Servatius. The other preachers of Rothmann's party were silenced, but were permitted to remain in the city and even Staprade found it possible to return. Within a few weeks, however, Rothmann in his sermons defended again the view that the baptism of infants is unscriptural. He published his *Confession of both Sacraments* in which he set forth the unscriptural character of infant baptism. The doctrine that baptism washes away inherited sin and that "when the child is christened, it is made a Christian" by baptism, Rothmann declared to be as "blasphemous idolatry and an abomination before God."[7]

The opinion has been advanced by Detmer and numerous other writers that Rothmann at this time must be considered an Anabaptist, since he defended the baptism of believers. But there were those who were even more outspoken in the rejection of infant baptism than Rothmann and nevertheless were not Anabaptists and are not considered such. Concerning Caspar Schwenckfeld, for example, August Baur says correctly: "His contradiction against infant baptism was by no means less pungent than that of the Anabaptists; indeed his opposition almost surpassed theirs in vehemence."[7a] Notwithstanding his convictions as to the unscripturalness of infant baptism, Schwenckfeld held that the practice of believers' baptism by the Anabaptists was, under existing conditions, a serious mistake. They erred greatly, in his opinion, by insisting on the baptism of believers, when to do so was considered a capital crime by the imperial authorities and brought the severest persecution by the Lutheran and Zwinglian governments as well. The Anabaptists, he said, made an idol of bearing the cross, that is, of enduring persecution because they practiced baptism which caused them to be per-

[6] Cornelius, *Münsterische-Aufruhr,* II, p. 365.

[7] Detmer u. Krumbholtz, *Zwei Schriften des Wiedertäufers Bernhard Rothmann,* p. 35.

[7a] Baur, *Zwinglis Theologie,* II, p. 252.

secuted. With Zwingli he believed that the abolition of the unscriptural infant baptism was not conducive to the prosperity of the church. Schwenckfeld was waiting for a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit which would bring both the cessation of persecution and the authority to baptize. Meanwhile he was ready for compromise. He advised his followers to remain in the national churches and held that those ministers of the state churches who were his followers, should retain their office and baptize the infants, pending further developments.[8]

Now the position of Rothmann on the question of baptism was similar to that of Schwenckfeld. When he wrote the letter of September 17 to the Council, he obviously believed that the magistrates would be compelled to yield the point of baptism and to permit him to teach the truth as he saw it. Doubtless such would have been the case, had the guilds as a whole taken his part, as heretofore. But some of the leading men in the guilds favored the practice of infant baptism and would not support him in this matter. Hence Rothmann consented to a glaring compromise. He pledged himself, not to defend, nor even to mention believers' baptism in his sermons. His followers took a similar attitude on the point in question. The baptism of adults was introduced and practiced in Münster only after Rothmann's party ruled the situation so completely that all danger of persecution had passed.

By no means could Rothmann be considered an Anabaptist in the autumn of the year 1533, although he had again begun to teach against infant baptism. He continued to be the preacher at St. Servatius Church, one of the churches of the city, and did not attempt a new church organization. Between his position and that of the Anabaptists on the issue in question there was a radical difference. It may be recalled that Menno Simons and other Anabaptists looked back with remorse of conscience to the time when they, as members of the ruling church, occupied a position similar to that of Rothmann. Menno, after his conversion, as well as the Swiss and Hutterite Brethren, emphasized repeatedly and emphatically that those who, to evade persecution or for any motive of policy, attended the worship of the state-church, and had their infants baptized, etc., were not their brethren. The thought that God's commandment should be set aside to please the civil authorities or to evade persecution, was heartily despised by the

[8] Ecke, *Schwenckfeld, Luther und der Gedanke einer evangelischen Reformation,* pp. 228 seq. One of Schwenckfeld's books against the Anabaptists was ably answered by Pilgram Marbeck in his *Verantwortung* which has recently been published by Christian Hege in Gedenkschrift zum 400jährigen Jubiläum der Mennoniten. (Karlsruhe, 1926), pp. 134-282.

Anabaptists. The most distinguished characteristic of the Anabaptists was, in fact, their attitude of non-compromise.

When Rothmann, notwithstanding his promise, began again to set forth his views on baptism in his sermons, the immediate result was a further widening of the breach between the two non-Catholic parties (led by Rothmann and von der Wieck respectively), and this, in turn, resulted in strengthening the Catholic element. Finally von der Wieck decided to make common cause with the Catholics against Rothmann. The result was that on November 4 the Council decreed that Rothmann, with the preachers that shared his views, should leave the city under a safe conduct to be granted them by the bishop. On the following day this decree was to be ratified and carried out. But it was generally believed that a mere command was not sufficient to accomplish the banishment of Rothmann. His opponents armed themselves and gathered in the market place. His followers in turn also made preparations for resistance. A bloody conflict seemed inevitable. But the party opposing Rothmann lacked a competent leader. They made the demand that those through whom Rothmann had attained to a position of influence should be banished with him, and that this decision should be carried out with the assistance of the bishop. It may be recalled that the actual separation between the party of Rothmann and von der Wieck had taken place only a comparatively short time before. Thus the intentions of the Catholic party were disclosed; with the assistance of the bishop they hoped to rid the city of all non-Romanists. "Then I realized," wrote von der Wieck later, "that Catholicism would again be introduced and the Gospel suppressed." He was now willing to consider the timely offer of Knipperdolling and other leading men in the guilds for a league against their common foe, the Catholic party. The latter were intimidated and kept themselves in the background.

But the two non-Catholic parties found it difficult to come to an agreement. The whole day and the night following both parties lay in arms against each other. A compromise was agreed upon on November 6: The preachers of Rothmann's party should leave the city under a safe conduct, while Rothmann himself was permitted to remain but should abstain from preaching.

Upon von der Wieck's request, Landgrave Philip of Hesse sent two Lutheran theologians to Münster. They assisted von der Wieck in working out a Lutheran agenda and ritual for ministers which was now accepted by the Council and the guilds. In the month of December, 1533, preachers representing the Lutheran creed had charge of all the parish churches of the city. The Landgrave of Hesse was asked to entice Rothmann away from Münster, inviting

him to his capital for a debate. Rothmann was inclined to accept the invitation, but within a short time matters took a new turn.

When the news spread abroad that Bernt Rothmann, in 1530, had espoused the Lutheran doctrine and that the Lutherans were not persecuted in Münster, some who were awakened through the writings of Martin Luther fled to Münster from the surrounding lands. Somewhat later Rothmann became a representative of Zwinglianism. The Council tolerated the Zwinglians. Some of the Zwinglians from far and near fled to Münster for refuge. And within a short time it became known in North Germany and the Netherlands that even those who openly questioned the validity of infant baptism were not persecuted at Münster. This news was of special interest to the Melchiorites, who rejected infant baptism in theory and were waiting a great political change which was supposed to be near, making it possible for them to introduce the practise of believers' baptism without persecution.[8a] Some of them fled to Münster to reinforce Rothmann's party. Some of his friends in the guilds became estranged from him when he attacked infant baptism, but the fugitive Melchiorites who came to the city made up in part for the loss.

We have seen that Rothmann was forbidden to preach. He had lost his office as minister of one of the churches of the city, but otherwise he enjoyed the liberty of the place. It was improbable that anywhere else he would be given the same freedom, except he renounce his views on baptism. At Münster he had many friends. He continued to be one of the most influential and powerful personages of the city. If he entertained ambitious plans, it was obvious that nowhere such opportunities presented themselves as here. He had it in his power, if he chose, to call to his aid a strong party who were ready to protect him at the point of the sword. Neither the Melchiorites nor the Wassenbergers, it should be remembered, taught the principle of non-resistance.

Dietrich Fabritius and Johann Lening, the two theologians sent to Münster by the Landgrave of Hesse, wrote to the Landgrave on November 15, 1533, that they had a discussion of a half a day with Rothmann and found that they agreed on all articles of faith, "excepting only that he can not recognize infant baptism as in accordance with Scripture."[9] From the pulpit the Landgrave's theologians said on the Sunday following, according to von der Wieck's report: "It is a small matter on which we are not of one

---

8a *Mennonite Quarterly Review,* Vol. VIII, p. 152.

9 Cornelius, *Münsterische-Aufruhr,* II, p. 359.

mind and [in the Scriptures] no time [age] is set when baptism should be received." In other words, they urged that the practice of believers' baptism should not in itself be rejected as unscriptural. The question, in the opinion of the preachers, was whether the baptism of adults or of infants would be more conducive to the prosperity of the Church. Their decision was from this point of view decidedly in favor of infant baptism. This was the attitude of Ulrich Zwingli and of his friends, Martin Butzer and Johann Oekolampad, on the point at issue; from the Lutheran point of view, however, this was unorthodox teaching. The Landgrave of Hesse, although nominally a Lutheran, was known to incline toward Zwinglianism and evidently the two theologians whom he sent to Münster were not strict Lutherans. It was generally known that Rothmann and his friends defended the Zwinglian (and Anabaptist) view of the Lord's supper, and yet the Landgrave's theologians said the only point of disagreement was baptism. To a more noticeable degree than ever before a Zwinglian current was in evidence in Hesse at this time.[10]

Fabritius made a public statement that "they," namely Lening and Fabritius, "held one doctrine with the party led by Rothmann and were well-nigh united with it." The followers of Rothmann demanded the reason why "the Council banished the other preachers from the city," while it protected Fabritius and his friends who, as their leader admitted, "have the same doctrine as the former and are almost one, and the point of infant baptism on which they differed is a small matter."[11] Fabritius now realized that he had acted indiscreetly. In consequence he interpreted his sermon in a way which met the approval of von der Wieck and the Council, but apparently this incident encouraged Rothmann to new efforts. Rothmann again became more aggressive in his attitude toward the Council. A disciple of Rothmann, the blacksmith Johann Schroeder of Werne, preached on December 8, 1533, in the churchyard of St. Lambert's church. It was the conviction of the ruling party that "as long as Rothmann remains in the city, nothing can be done."[12]

On December 11 Rothmann received orders to leave the city. He openly defied the command of the magistrates and declared that empty threatenings against him were useless. His followers supported him in this attitude. On December 14 he began again to preach in the churchyard of St. Servatius. On the day following Johann Schroeder was arrested for preaching in public. But at

[10] Compare F. Herrmann in *Beitr. z. Hess. Kirchengesch.*, V, part 4, pp. 288-290.
[11] Cornelius, *Münsterische-Aufruhr*, II, p. 371.
[12] *Ibid.*, II, p. 369.

once the smith guild in a body marched to the city hall and demanded his release; they threatened if their request was not immediately granted to force the prison doors. The magistrates found themselves powerless to maintain their authority; they yielded. Schroeder was led in triumph to a public house where the victory was celebrated with hilarity and revelry. Shortly after this occurrence the banished preachers returned to the city. Rothmann again began to preach from the pulpit of St. Servatius Church and his friends found it possible to take charge of other churches of the city. At the beginning of the month of January, 1534, Rothmann's party had taken possession of all the churches except St. Lambert where Fabritius preached. Only a shadow of authority was left to the Council.

By this time Rothmann was not merely a religious leader he had become the head of a radical party which openly defied the powers that be—a demagogue. But this was not really his field. Conditions in Münster were ripe for the appearance of some political leader to take Rothmann's place.

As said above, Münster had for some time been the refuge of those who were persecuted for conscience' sake, particularly since the town of Wassenberg could no longer function as an asylum. As the great movement on foot in the city changed its coloring and assumed a political character, Münster, besides being the asylum of those whose conscience revolted against the state church tenets, became the rendezvous of an entirely different class—those whose conscience was so liberal and elastic that the civil authorities had just cause for complaint. The rabble of the surrounding lands, those who had nothing to lose and all to gain, were greatly interested in the news of the pending radical political change.

Rothmann as early as the summer of 1533 began to emphasize the thought of Christian stewardship in his sermons—the Christian's duty to use his possessions for the good of his needy and suffering fellows. This was welcome news to the extremely poor, especially since in certain parts of the Low Countries there was dearness of food prices in consequence of failure of crops. Not a few had heard of the prophecies concerning the great change and the new time in which religious liberty should reign supreme.

Early in January, 1534, Rothmann's party ruled the situation at Münster. Persecution for them was now entirely out of the question. Had not the time come therefore when the practice of the unscriptural baptism of infants was no longer required for the prosperity of the Church, the time when political conditions permitted of adult baptism without persecution, nay when the baptism of adults could be made the signal of revolutionary endeavors?

(To be continued)

BOOK REVIEW

The Reformation and English Education. By NORMAN WOOD (of Chalfont St. Peter, England). A Study of the Influence of Religious Uniformity on English Education in the Sixteenth Century. London, George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1931.

Although this book contains XIII and 365 pages, including a comprehensive table of contents, a bibliography and a well-arranged subject index with cross references, it is introduced as an "abridgment" of a thesis entitled "Religious Uniformity and English Education in the Sixteenth Century." As such it had been submitted and approved for the degree of Ph.D. at the University of London. The study was made available in print with the help of the Publication Fund of that University.

Reference is made in the MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW to this study on the uniformity policies of the Established (Protestant Episcopal) Church of England because it serves as a parallel study of conditions existing on the continent. Here the same principles were being applied by the Protestant Church and the Protestant State in interfering with the individual's conscience. This stood in contrast with the destruction by the Reformers of the unity of Western Christendom. The outcome of the Reformation "by no means established the right of the individual to personal judgment on religion." Sixteenth century agencies of education (including preachers and preaching) were investigated by Dr. Wood, showing the forms and methods used to discourage the English people from independent religious thinking and from worshiping according to their own convictions.

There was "more activity in preaching outside the established clergy than there was within their ranks. We hear more of the sermons of Anabaptists and Lutherans in Henry the Eighth's time . . . " (page 224). Thomas Becon, one of the influential Protestants under Henry VIII and Edward VI, urged in his *Newe Catechisme* that a good schoolmaster should teach against the doctrines of the "divers and sundry damnable sects as papists, anabaptists, Arians, Davidians . . . " (page 180). These two references to Anabaptism in England fail, as most of them do, to give an adequate idea of the movement. Its history in England has been only partly covered and is much in need of a thoroughgoing study. An outline has been suggested in my article "England" in the *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* Volume I, pp. 584-591 (1923), based on scattered printed sources available at that time. Attention is called to Professor C. Eden Quainton's recent study on "The Anabaptists in England during the Commonwealth, 1648-1654," in the January, 1932, MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW (pp. 30-42), an encouraging contribution toward a general discussion of English Anabaptism proper. Other direct or indirect data on the English movement should be registered in these pages until a complete description will finally be forthcoming. Little, however, can be done with the statement given by Dr. Wood (page 201) "In England the Anabaptists in their preachings supported the view that religion was not a matter for State interference and that the civil authorities were subordinate to the clerics." The lack of verification is probably due to the author's obligation to compress the facts giving us only "an abridgment of a much longer compilation."

Ernst Correll, *American University.*

Washington, D. C. (1932).